



## ATTACHMENT A

### Remarks

Claims 1-10 were pending in this application. Of these claims, claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 10 have been indicated to be allowable. Claims 1-10 have been cancelled and replaced by new claims 11 to 21. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 11 to 21 patentably define over the cited references.

Original claims 1, 4, 6, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being "unpatentable over" the Akira reference in view of the Tomomatsu et al ("Tomomatsu") reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed although, as indicated above, the original claims have been canceled and new independent claims 11 and 15 have been presented.

The Akira patent discloses a circularly polarized wave antenna device formed by two "orthogonally crossing" patch electrodes 3 and 7 arranged on the upper face of a substantially rectangular dielectric substrate 2. In other words, two patch electrodes or radiation electrodes 3, 7 are formed on a single dielectric chip and form part of a single antenna.

The Tomomatsu patent discloses an antenna including a chip antenna mounted on a substrate. Only a single dielectric chip antenna is formed.

Turning to the new claims, claim 11 recites a high frequency antenna module comprising a substrate, first and second feeding lines and first and second dielectric chip antennas of the same frequency. Each of the chip antennas comprises a  $\lambda/4$  antenna formed by a respective dielectric chip and each chip includes a feeding electrode and a radiation electrode. The first and second chip antennas are mounted on the substrate with the associated feeding electrode being connected to a respective feeding lines. Each radiation electrode has a base end connected to the associated feeding electrode and a floating end forming an open end of the corresponding chip antenna, wherein the distance between the open ends of the dielectric chip antennas is shorter than the distance between the base ends thereof.

It is respectfully submitted that neither of the references whether taken singly or in combination discloses an arrangement including first and second dielectric chip

antennas mounted on a substrate much less first and second chip antennas of the type claimed and arranged as claimed.

Turning to claim 15, this claim recites a high frequency antenna module comprising a substrate, first and second feeding lines, and first and second antennas of the same frequency and comprising a radiation electrode forming a  $\lambda/4$  internal antenna used for a portable or wireless application with the antennas being mounted on the substrate and with each in contact with a respective one of the feeding lines. Claim 15 further recites that each of the radiation electrodes has a base end connected to a feeding electrode and a floating end forming an open end of the antenna and additionally provides that the distance between the open ends of the two antennas is shorter than the distance between the base ends.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 15 defines over the references for similar reasons to those set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 11. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the Akira and Tomomatsu references, whether taken singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest the provision of first and second antennas of the claimed type mounted on a substrate, much less the particular arrangement of the radiation electrodes forming the two antennas. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 15 patentably defines over the cited references.

For the record, it is noted that new claim 11 is supported, inter alia, by original claim 1, the third to fifth lines of claim 2, page 1, lines 5 and 6, and page 6, lines 14 and 15. New claim 15 is supported, inter alia, by original claim 4, page 1 lines 5 and 6 and page 6 lines 14 and 15. New claims 20 and 21 are supported, inter alia, by the original disclosure at page 9, lines 12 to 17, page 11, lines 10 and 11 and 12 to 14. All of the other claims are based on original claims and, for example, new claim 12 is based on original claim 2 whereas new claim 16 is based on original claim 5. In the latter regard, it is noted that original claims 2 and 5 have been indicated to be allowable.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

**END REMARKS**